

REMARKS

This document is filed in reply to the Office Action dated March 23, 2007 (“Office Action”). Applicants cancelled claims 1-36 and substituted new claims 37-75 for them. Support for the new claims can be found in the original claims and throughout the specification. Examples of the support are listed in Table 1 below. No new matter has been introduced.

Table 1. Support for Claim Amendments

New Claims	Support
Claim 37	original claims 1, 4, 6, and 22
Claims 38-43	original claims 2, 3, 11, 5, 7, and 8, respectively
Claim 44	original claims 12 and 13
Claim 45	original claims 28 and 29
Claims 46 and 47	original claims 15 and 14, respectively
Claims 48 and 49	specification page 25, lines 5-18
Claim 50	original claim 16
Claims 51-56	specification page 17 line 4 to page 19, line 16
Claims 57-64	original claims 17-21 and 23-25 respectively
Claims 65 and 66	specification page 13 line 31 to page 14, line 8
Claim 67	original claim 26
Claim 68	specification page 17, lines 9-14
Claims 69-75	original claims 27 and 30-35, respectively

Upon entry of the proposed amendments, claims 37-75 will be pending and under examination. Reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected original claims 1, 7, 22, 23, 27, 30, 33, and 36 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 3146752 or US Patent No. 3922994. See the Office Action, page 2, lines 9-10 and lines 21-22. On the other hand, the Examiner acknowledged that “[c]laims 2-6, 8-21, 24-26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, and 35 ... would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.” See page 3, lines 4-7.

In the sole interest of moving this case towards allowance, Applicants have substituted new claims 37-75 for original claims 1-36. Independent claim 37 includes the

Applicants : Christopher Heyring *et al.*
Serial No. : 10/524,499
Filed : September 28, 2005
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney Docket No.: 47801-002US1
Client Ref. No.: SJS:LG:FP21111

limitations in claim 6, which is allowable as acknowledged by the Examiner. In view of the amendments, Applicants submit that claim 37 and claims 38-75, which depend from claim 37, are allowable.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The excess claims fee in the amount of \$75 is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 50-4189, referencing Attorney Docket No. 47801-002US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6-22-2007



Jianming Hao, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 54,694

Customer No. 69713
Occhiuti Rohlicek & Tsao LLP
10 Fawcett Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Telephone: (617) 500-2512
Facsimile: (617) 500-2499
1267.doc